

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

In the claims

Claim 1 is amended to substantially incorporate the features previously set forth in claim 2, by reciting “at least a printed circuit board disposed in said main body, said printed circuit board having an opening, and centroids of said opening and said airflow channel being positioned at a same axis substantially vertical to said top surface and said bottom surface.”

Support for this amendment is found at least in original claim 2, as well as paragraph [0018] on page 4, and paragraph [0037] on page 7 of the original specification.

Claim 2 is cancelled, and claim 3 is amended to correct its dependency.

Rejection of claims 1, 4-6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); Allowable subject matter

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Nygren et al. (U.S. 6,201,705) in view of Pleitz et al. (U.S. 5,521,792), and claim 5 is rejected as unpatentable over Nygren as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Chuang (U.S. 2002/0095713). However, the examiner has indicated that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. in this regard, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the feature of the printed circuit board having an opening, and centroids of the opening and the airflow channel being positioned at a same axis substantially vertical to the top surface and the bottom surface, substantially as set forth in allowable claim 2.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is now allowable, as substantially corresponding to the examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither Nygren nor Pleitz, either individually or in any combination, discloses or suggests a printed circuit board having an opening, and centroids of the opening and the airflow channel being positioned at the same axis substantially vertical to the top surface and the bottom surface as recited in the amended claim 1 of the present application.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-6, and 8 are all allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1, 3-6, and 8 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: 2/1/08



JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921